

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 93 17:27:32 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1278
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Thu, 28 Oct 93 Volume 93 : Issue 1278

Today's Topics:

Full Duplex Kids' HT's
GAY INTERNATIONAL HAM RADIO CLUB (2 msgs)
HP48 logging/dup PGM???
magazine article about antenna tuners
Request for Schedule: Radio Finland
Special (vanity) calls
STS-58 QSL
SuperCharger Alkaline charger RVW
TRS Model 100 for RTTY/CW/Packet
Using FT-980 on MARS?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 28 Oct 93 18:53:20 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Full Duplex Kids' HT's
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In <199310271641.JAA05378@ucsd.edu>
William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

>i look at the catalog i have just received from Tiger Software. on Page 5
>they offer the Sony ICB-1500 "My First Sony Walkie Talkie Set".

>Price is \$49.90.

>Anyone know what's in these? They aren't the typical 49 MHz kids walkie
>talkies. the full duplex part is interesting. maybe something convertible to
>amateur radio use?

The 49 (and 46) MHz band is used by cordless telephones,
"baby momitors" and low-power "kiddie-style" walkie talkies and
personal communication devices. All in the milliwatt range.

I suspect that these full duplex jobs are sold in matched
pairs so that one's TX and RX frequency is inverted with respect
to the other. You can probably pick up an occasional cordless
phone conversation with them.

--

Kevin Jessup !politically_correct

The U.S. Constitution defines the rights the people
give to the government, not the reverse!

Date: 28 Oct 93 14:35:46 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!emory!news-
feed-2.peachnet.edu!concert!duke!news.duke.edu!ee.ee.duke.edu!
jbs@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: GAY INTERNATIONAL HAM RADIO CLUB
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <dbledsoeCFJK67.FAB@netcom.com> dbledsoe@netcom.com (Donnelly R.
Bledsoe) writes:

>

>There are several problems with this state of affairs for LARC. Contrary
>to the statement of George Wilson, the ARRL's "policy" regarding our ad
>remains unclear and unstated.

ARRL has offered to publish your ad. In effect they are acknowledging that
they made a mistake in the past. There is no reason whatsoever for ARRL to
make a "policy statement" on your, or any other individual, ad.

> While the ARRL is now prepared to publish
>one specific ad, we have received no assurance that this decision would
>not be reversed as it was in 1985 if League members once again complain about
>its publication. In the absence of a stated assurance that our ad will not
>once again be removed, how can we possibly drop our complaint?

What a load of bullcrap. You know perfectly well that they wouldn't drop your
ad again. If they did, you might really have grounds for a complaint. As it
stands now you have none. They're offering to run your ad. You guys aren't

interested in running your ad, you're interested in grinding political axes. The ARRL is not your political playground.

>We also have concerns relative to the precise wording of Sumner's
>statement to us that LARC's ad _as submitted in 1991_ is acceptable. We
>should be able to submit any appropriately worded ham ad for publication in
>QST. Why are we limited to just one particular wording?

Obviously you're not. Any publication has the right to decline advertising that it deems offensive. After your complaint and their reversal on the decision to run your ad, they're not going to pull your ad as long as it's not vulgar. If you submitted a sexually suggestive or obscene ad (which I'm sure you wouldn't do), I would hope they'd not run it.

>Yes, on the advice of counsel, our complaint remains pending in Connecticut.
>Our complaint alleges discrimination based on sexual orientation in public
>accommodations in violation of Connecticut law. Let me point out that it
>was only after the ARRL learned of our intent to file our complaint that
>the Executive Committee met and decided to return the decision relative to
>LARC's ad back to staff.

Yeah, well, frequently it takes a threat of action to make someone realize they have taken an untenable position. They reversed that position to a reasonable one, now you guys should shut up and get on with your lives. Of course, you won't do that because your main interest is not getting your ad run.

> In other words, they dropped the hot potato back
>into HQ's lap. However, HQ has not stated any new "policy" nor rescinded
>any previous "policy" vis-a-vis LARC.

They have no reason to formulate a policy for LARC. You're just another radio club - come down off your high hobby horse.

> Even though there have been
>literally dozens of letters from LARC members and other concerned hams
>seeking clarifications, explanations, and simply a clear statement of
>policy from the ARRL regarding LARC's ad since 1985, not one word of the
>now eight year old dispute has ever appeared in print in QST. Under these
>circumstances, we cannot now simply drop our complaint. If we did so,
>prior to receiving assurances of fair treatment and an end to the
>discriminatory practices aimed at us since 1985, we would be leaving
>ourselves without protection and recourse should the League once again
>reverse itself on our ad as they did in 1985.

More bullcrap. These "discriminatory practices" consisted solely of a bad decision not to run your ad, and that decision was reversed. There are no discriminatory practices aimed at you any more, or haven't you noticed that?

If they were to again unreasonably decline your ad, you would have all the position in the world - you could always file a lawsuit. You can't do that now, because you have no basis since they've offered to run your ad.

>{rest of drive1 deleted}

-joe

--

You spend the night
Like you were spending a dime
- Lyle Lovett

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 1993 16:55:40 GMT
From: paperboy.ids.net!anomaly.sbs.com!kd1hz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: GAY INTERNATIONAL HAM RADIO CLUB
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

dbledsoe@netcom.com (Donnelly R. Bledsoe) writes:

> There are several problems with this state of affairs for LARC. Contrary
> to the statement of George Wilson, the ARRL's "policy" regarding our ad
> remains unclear and unstated. While the ARRL is now prepared to publish
> one specific ad, we have received no assurance that this decision would
> not be reversed as it was in 1985 if League members once again complain about
> its publication. In the absence of a stated assurance that our ad will not
> once again be removed, how can we possibly drop our complaint?

Many people wrote to the League and complained that they felt the Motorola ad which appeared in the last issue of QST was offensive and in poor taste. I don't know if the folks at ARRL will do anything, but its certainly within their right to do so. If the League were to pull the advertisement from subsequent issues, should Motorola have the right to sue the League for "discrimination"?

> We also have concerns relative to the precise wording of Sumner's
> statement to us that LARC's ad _as submitted in 1991_ is acceptable. We
> should be able to submit any appropriately worded ham ad for publication in
> QST. Why are we limited to just one particular wording?

As a former editor, I would not give any advertiser "blanket" acceptance of their advertisements. Each advertisement would be examined individually to see if they conform to standards which we set for the magazine. The key phrase in your paragraph above is "appropriately worded ham ad". The League, as publisher, determines what is "appropriately worded", not you. Thus, stating that your current submitted ad is "acceptable" is as about

as good as you're going to get. I doubt any publisher would give you a blanket acceptance, without any form of editorial approval over your ad contents. To do so might yield future problems.

- > prior to receiving assurances of fair treatment and an end to the
- > discriminatory practices aimed at us since 1985, we would be leaving
- > ourselves without protection and recourse should the League once again
- > reverse itself on our ad as they did in 1985.

Based upon what I've read, I don't feel that the League's position was in any way discriminatory. If I were to run an advertisement in your organization's newsletter which your members overwhelming felt was distasteful, you would be perfectly within your right to reject future advertisements of that sort. In order to show that the League was discriminating against gays, you have to show that the League has a pattern of refusing ads from every gay group that sends an ad for publication.

- > What we are seeking is written assurance that LARC's ad (any appropriately
- > worded, ham radio related ad) will be published on an ongoing basis by QST
- > even if complaints from members are received relative to sexual
- > orientation, i.e., that the words gay, lesbian, bi-sexual or transgendered
- > appear in the ad.

Was this the basis for the League's retraction of the original advertisement?

- > We feel that this might best be accomplished if the
- > League adopts, publishes and abides by a corporate non-discriminatory policy
- > which includes sexual orientation.

Even if the League were to adopt such a policy, that still has no effect on editorial license. Simply rejecting an advertisement that members complained about does not equate to "gay discrimination".

- > Therefore, we are asking the League to
- > adopt such a policy which would also serve to re-assure any sexual minority
- > employees of the League that their employer does not discriminate based on
- > sexual orientation.

Do you have any evidence to support the contention that the League discriminates against employees based upon their sexual orientation?

- > Further, the League must recognize that they have hurt

> our organization by freezing us out of QST since 1985.

If the League has been willing to publish a revised advertisement for the past two years, then clearly it is you, not the League, that has chosen to be "frozen" out, as you have selected not to place the advertisement for publication.

> At minimum, the League publication QST MUST be made accessible to LARC
> and its members. We've been frozen out since 1985. We're looking for a
> good faith gesture to demonstrate that we now have access to
> QST, that discrimination against us has ended, and that the League's motto
> "Of, by and for the radio amateur" applies to all hams, gay or straight.

The League is refusing to publish the recently-submitted ad which David Summer said was "acceptable"? If not, and it is simply your choice not to have the advertisement run until you receive "assurances", then you have no basis to claim that the League has "frozen out" your organization. It is you yourself who have decided to stay out in the cold.

Does the League not allow gay people to join? Then, clearly your cries of discrimination are mere hogwash, designed to attract attention to yourself. Obviously, you are more interested in attracting attention via claims of "discrimination" rather than actually running an ad.

MD

--
-- Michael P. Deignan, KD1HZ -
-- Internet: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com - Providence Firefighters Association:
-- UUCP: ...!uunet!anomaly!kd1hz - We Find 'Em Hot, And Leave 'Em Wet
-- AT&TNet: 401-273-4669 -

Date: 28 Oct 93 21:07:43 GMT
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!usenet.ucs.indiana.edu!
master.cs.rose-hulman.edu!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: HP48 logging/dup PGM???
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2an8s3\$2m1@vixen.cso.uiuc.edu> ahall@ux4.cso.uiuc.edu (Allen John Hall) writes:

> Hello everyone,

>

> I was told by a good friend of mine that there was

> a program for logging/dupping on on the HP48 calc.
> I was wondering if someone could send it my way
> (uue if needed), or could point me in the right
> direction. I think it was mentioned in one of the
> new QST's
>
> TNX for the trouble!
> Allen Hall n9rzc@uiuc.edu

A very good program was written by Jim Osburn, WD9EYB. His e=mail address is;

jpo@acd4.acd.com

I've used the program. It'll do it!

73 de Jack, K9CUN

Date: 28 Oct 93 21:33:08 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: magazine article about antenna tuners
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Here is a quote from a recent magazine article about antenna tuners:

"... it (the antenna tuner) also tunes out all mismatches in the system, including transmission line to antenna mismatch, and also any non-resonance in the antenna itself."

Question: Is the meaning clear and if so, what is the meaning?

73, Cecil, kg7bk@indirect.com
(I do not speak for Intel on Internet)

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 1993 14:57:36 GMT
From: fluke!inc@beaver.cs.washington.edu
Subject: Request for Schedule: Radio Finland
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

COuld someone post the schedule for Radio Finland's North-American broadcasts please? Or their address so I could request a printed copy? I am interested in both the English and Finnish language programs, less so the Swedish ones.

I have borrowed a Sony ICF-2001 from a friend who wants to sell it. I had no luck with it a few years back, but I was living in spot known for poor reception. I now live in a place that is said to have better reception, and plan to use a long wire antenna. In Washington state, should this run NE to SW for best reception of Radio Finland, or what? Any other hints on picking it up? For testing, can I use my TV antenna? I'd rather not put up an antenna until I'm reasonably sure I'm going to need it!

Thanks in advance for any advice --

--

Gary Benson-_____-inc@tc.fluke.com-_____

We are what we repeatedly do. Excellence is not a single act, but a habit.
-Aristotle

Date: 28 Oct 93 19:29:40 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@hplabs.hp.com
Subject: Special (vanity) calls
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Derek Wills (oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu) wrote:

: ... and all
: those who can copy 40+ wpm get to choose the calls with lots of Es,
: for 30-40 wpm you get those with Is etc. No-coders, including the
: Extras who can't recognize their own calls at 10 wpm, get the calls
: that have Q, Y, J and all the other junk. Simple.

Isn't that backwards? Seems like the slow pokes should get the short calls -- they need all the help they can get!

AL N1AL
(Soon to be WQ6Y0Q?)

Date: 28 Oct 93 21:29:14 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: STS-58 QSL
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

On the way in to work this morning, I happened to hear one of the operators on the shuttle working several stations. I didn't have the uplink frequencies, or I would have tried to make contact myself.

At any rate, my question is:

Can I get a shuttle QSL for a reception-only report?

Where do I send the report? Should I include a SASE or stamps?

I was really amazed when I realized I was really hearing the shuttle.
I left the frequency in my scan just for grins, never expecting it
to pay off.

(reply to the group, or direct to my e-mail address below)

Thanks in advance,

Tom Leber

N3QKV

Tom Leber N3QKV <leber@panther.warm.inmet.com> Intermetrics, Inc. Warminster PA
"One step ahead, one step behind...Pretty soon you gotta' run to stay even."

Date: Thu, 28 Oct 1993 15:31:06 GMT

From: nntp.ucsb.edu!library.ucla.edu!agate!linus!linus.mitre.org!mwvm.mitre.org!
m14494@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: SuperCharger Alkaline charger RVW

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

brett miller writes:

> You may have seen the info-mercial on TV staring Dick Clarke, which
> advertises a product called Super Charger, by Buddy L....

> I ordered the portable model 8001...

> TEST #1...

> TEST #2...

> THE BOTTOM LINE

> Send it back! As you can see, the charger made no real difference in
> how long the batteries lasted.

Good show, Brett. This is the first quantitative
data I've seen. I hope you will repeat your experiment
with the new Ray-O-Vac Renewal batteries and charger.

Mike, N4PDY

* These are my opinions only*

Date: Wed, 27 Oct 1993 16:40:35 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!umn.edu!gold.tc.umn.edu!
fede0001@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: TRS Model 100 for RTTY/CW/Packet
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

>Has anyone used a TRS Model 100 to interpret radio signals like
>RTTY, CW or Packet?

>Specifically, it occurred to us that the Cassette port could decode
>and encode digital signals at the low baud rates typical of RTTY
>or packet that we could plug the rig directly in withOUT a TNC.

>Love to hear any suggestions or success stories.

I used to own a Tandy Color Computer III before moving to MSDOS, and
there were a wealth of amateur files for CW, RTTY, etc, using both the
joystick ports and the cassette port. Some files can be found at
delphi.com for those. No TNC was needed. Assembled programs that
interpreted the incoming CW or RTTY did the job. Needless to say, they
were *very* touchy.

73's, Jay

* * * * *
* Jason E. Gross (KB0JZP) * "The gene pool has no lifeguard." *
* fede0001@gold.tc.umn.edu * * *
* University of MN (TC) * Views expressed within are mine, all MINE! *
* * * * *

Date: Tue, 26 Oct 1993 08:45:20 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
darwin.sura.net!martha.utcc.utk.edu!rick@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Using FT-980 on MARS?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Recently, I attended the hamfest at Grey, TN, where I spoke
to someone about becoming a MARS affiliate. One problem is
that my transceiver, a Yaesu FT-980, does not transmit on
MARS frequencies. I was told that the MARS net in East Tennessee
operates on 4040 khz.

Can someone tell me whether my FT-980 can be easily modified to transmit on 4040 khz or thereabouts, and if so, how to do it.

Thanks,

Rick
KD4LDM/AA

Date: 28 Oct 93 07:39:36 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
kos4mac20.berkeley.edu!user@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CF2wpI.vx@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <jlrCFL2rF.4uo@netcom.com>,
<2ap28h\$pj5@news.acns.nwu.edu>
Subject : Re: Homonauseated (Was: Newslane #842)

rdewan@casbah.acns.nwu.edu (Rajiv Dewan) wrote:
>Gosh! Am I going to add to this thread? ;(Well, the following
>statement piqued my evolution theory instinct:

I'm making the same error...

> ... a few lines have been mercifully deleted for brevity ...

Joe L. Reda <jlr@netcom.com> wrote:
>>empty arguments . . I've heard that one before: "We love the sinner but
>>we hate the sin!". Here's a consciousness-raiser for you: with the
>>exception of homosexuality, all of the above behaviors are learned or
>>chosen. No one *chooses* to be gay. Ever heard of genetics?
>
>Curious. Based on my rudimentary understanding of theory of evolution,
>I would have thought that if being gay was genetic there would not be
>any one around left to talk about it. The fact that there are gay people
>would seem to imply the opposite.

Genetics isn't so simple most of the time. Any single gene can have multiple roles and effects on an organism's "fitness." Besides, there's not likely to be any single gene that affects a particular set of behaviors. Most likely, it's a combination of factors.

Evolution is even less simple. Not all bad traits are eliminated from the population. For example, each of us probably carries at least one lethal mutation which would kill us if we had the wrong combination of genes. It depends on the selective pressure and the local environment of the organism. Things become even less clear when the gene in question

has multiple effects. Who knows then which role of the gene (or combination of genes) is being selected? These sorts of questions are extremely difficult to address even in simple model systems. Besides, being homosexual doesn't eliminate the ability to reproduce (Being a Catholic priest doesn't seem to stop people either :^)

Adding to this confusing mess is the role of the environment in development. And I don't just mean a fussy mother or strict father. There are any number of potentially random events (chemical exposure, temperature during pregnancy, RF exposure, etc.), well outside our ability to influence, which affect an organism's development. For instance, no identical twins are every completely identical.

Still, when a homosexual or lesbian says that they've had these feelings since early childhood, there's not necessarily a reason to doubt that they were "born that way." Even if there's no gene for homosexuality, that doesn't mean that it's purely cultural or that it's reversible. In many cases, once an organism is committed to a particular developmental path, it's stuck. (Maybe I'd be taller if I didn't lose weight for wrestling in High School. Too late now, though.)

Personally, I don't think the complete case has been made yet for a "Gay gene" which unequivocally determines a person's sexual preference, but it does seem that there are factors outside of our control that do have an influence (possibly irreversible). Still, this really shouldn't determine how one should treat them.

An aside:

What many here seem to object to about homosexuality is the perceived "in your face" attitude of some gays (ie. "If they kept it to themselves, I wouldn't mind it as much"). I think these disturbing experiences color all other perceptions about gays. Unfortunately, this view fails to distinguish political activity from social activity. ACT-UP and many other "in your face" groups represent what is basically a political segment of the homosexual and lesbian population and certainly do not represent them all. The generation prior to the ACT-UP constituents were much quieter and less obtrusive. Most still are. By the same reasoning that one doesn't discount religion because of the Randall Terrys of the world, one shouldn't treat all homosexuals with the same disrespect just because a few go overboard and "shock" your sensibilities. Every group has its slimeballs, just as every group has its saints.

Regards,
Tim Ikeda
timi@mendel.berkeley.edu

Date: 28 Oct 93 23:07:54 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!perry@hplabs.hp.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <dbledsoeCFHryr.1tF@netcom.com>, <CFJ304.Bp5@fc.hp.com>,
<jfhCFKJK1.C53@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: GAY INTERNATIONAL HAM RADIO CLUB

Jack Hamilton (jfh@netcom.com) wrote:
: perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) wrote:

Sorry to beat this to death.

: >As I understand the 1st amendment, the ARRL can print whatever they
: >want. Do the civil rights of LARC exceed those of the ARRL?

: The ARRL is not an ordinary private citizen. It receives government
: support (non-profit status) and has some governmental privileges
: (administering tests, for example).

A technical nit - I thought the LARC complaint was lodged against the
ARRL on the basis of CT law, not Federal law. Another technical nit -
state law is superceded by the US Constitution. Freedom of press is
ACTUALLY MENTIONED there. The "sexual minority" patchwork of case law
is a recent machination of the Judicial Branch.

I think what bothers me about the LARC complaint is that it seeks to
make LARC more equal than everyone else. Under the envisioned scenario,
the ARRL must justify their decision to conduct or not conduct business
when minority organizations are involved. By virtue of the ad, LARC
identifies its self-described "minority" status and exacts an extra
quantum of deliberation over and above any other individual or
organization. What was a "can we use this?" decision (apropos to
an Editor) becomes a "how do we refuse this and still be Politically
Correct?" exercise in semantic gymnastics.

: >: LARC believes that to go ahead and run the advertising without
: >: resolution of the underlying issue will undermine its own complaint. So,
: >: until the ARRL will discuss the real issue of discrimination, the issue of
: >: advertising cannot be resolved.
: >
: >What discrimination? The ARRL refused to print my article. Do I get to
: >sue them too?

: If the ARRL said "We won't print your article because you're gay/black/
: jewish", then yes, you should sue.

Gee. The ARRL was nonspecific - the old "don't need it right now" line
as I recall. How silly of me not to have pressed them for the REAL
reason. It's hard to work a homosexual thread into a construction
project.

Perry

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1278

